Minutes of the MLA Executive Council

[Note: The Executive Council voted to approve these minutes at its May 2012 meeting.]


On 24 February, the council began by meeting in executive session to review council members’ fiduciary responsibilities. Following the executive session, the council convened in regular session to begin working through its agenda. Soon after lunch, the council met in subcommittees. The Subcommittee on Administration and Finance reviewed four staff reports and one staff request and considered appointments to five MLA committees. Attending were Michael Bérubé, chair; María Herrera-Sobek; Lanisa Kitchiner; Lutz Koepnick; and Karin Ryding. The Subcommittee on Projects (Marianne Hirsch, chair; Samer Ali; Barbara Altman; Jonathan Arac; and Richard Ohmann) met to discuss four staff reports and two staff requests and to consider appointments to six MLA committees. The Subcommittee on Meetings and Publications (Margaret Ferguson, chair; Debra Castillo; Jennifer Crewe; Dorothea Heitsch; Mecca Sullivan; and Kathleen Woodward) reviewed five staff reports and two requests and considered appointments to six MLA committees. At the conclusion of the subcommittee meetings, the full council reconvened in regular session to hear the reports and recommendations of its subcommittees and to begin taking action on the requests before it. On 25 February, in three regular sessions, the council continued working through its agenda. The council adjourned at 1:55 p.m., having concluded all the business before it.

The council took the following actions:
1. Administration and Finance. The council received the independent auditor’s report and financial statements for the year ended 31 August 2011, which showed that the association concluded the fiscal year with a surplus of $723,639 in the unrestricted fund. Members of the council’s Audit Committee commented briefly on their meeting with representatives of the independent auditor, EisnerAmper LLP, and the council voted to accept and approve the audit report and financial statements.

The council also received the Finance Committee’s report, which reviewed the budget for the current fiscal year using four-month projections. Rosemary Feal said it was too early in the fiscal year to make changes to budget projections, except in the categories where actual revenue and expenses had been recorded (e.g., for the convention), and she noted that the overall budget deficit reported in October had been reduced. Feal reviewed the status of the association’s reserves (the endowment plus the cash reserve) and explained that the association does not draw on the endowment to pay operating expenses. She also responded to council members’ questions.

The Finance Committee asked the council to consider several matters relating to the preparation of a budget for the fiscal year 2012–13, and the council authorized the staff to prepare a balanced budget.

The council adopted the following resolution relating to financial management. [Note: The president certified the council’s action by signing the original document containing the resolution. The document was then stamped with the association’s corporate seal.]

WHEREAS, article 4, section E of the constitution of the Modern Language Association provides as follows: “The permanent fund of the association and its other endowment funds shall be administered by a board of three trustees, each appointed by the Executive Council for a three-year term, the three terms to be staggered by one year. One of the trustees shall be designated the managing trustee”; and

WHEREAS, Herbert Lindenberger, Malcolm Smith, and Catharine Stimpson have been appointed by the Executive Council as the three trustees with authority to administer the permanent fund of the association and its other endowment funds, and Malcolm Smith has been designated the managing trustee of this committee (the “Permanent Fund Committee”);

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED, that, upon the written direction to Rosemary G. Feal as executive director, Judy Goulding as associate executive director and director of publishing operations, and Terrence Callaghan as director of operations of any member of the Permanent Fund Committee to effect the purchase, transfer, sale, or other disposition of any security or securities held in the permanent fund or any other endowment funds, the executive director, associate executive director and director of publishing operations, and director of operations be and hereby are authorized and directed to take all such steps and to execute and deliver all such documents as they shall deem necessary or appropriate to effect such purchase, transfer, sale, or other disposition; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the president of the MLA be and hereby is authorized and directed to certify this resolution to any third party requiring delivery of same in order to substantiate the proper authority for the disposition of the securities of the permanent fund or any other endowment funds.

The council authorized the following staff members to sign nonpayroll checks over $1,000: Terrence Callaghan, Barbara Chen, Rosemary Feal, Judy Goulding, Maribeth Kraus, and David Laurence.

Finally, the council reappointed Jennifer Crewe and appointed Richard Ohmann to the council’s Audit Committee for 2012.

2. Revision of the MLA Dues Schedule. The Executive Council confirmed the action taken by the 2012 Delegate Assembly to revise the dues schedule of the association (see May 2012 PMLA 672–74). The table on page 1026 shows the new dues schedule, which includes increases over the next three years.

3. Establishment of Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature. Pursuant to the recommendation of the council’s planning group on graduate education (see May 2012 PMLA 692), the council established the Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature and gave it the following charge:

The Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature will consider the prospects for doctoral study in modern language and literature in the light of transformations in higher education and scholarly communication, including: developments in the academic job market, changing conditions and expectations for new faculty members, and placements in nonfaculty positions. The task force will review information on the current state of graduate education, including but not limited to questions of cost, program structure (including examinations and dissertation expectations), time to degree, diversity, professional development, and job placement. The task force will study relevant MLA documents and other publications, consult with appropriate experts on specific topics, and solicit opinions widely through venues such as open meetings at the annual convention. The task force should identify several graduate programs already exploring new approaches to doctoral education or prepared to do so and assess implementation strategies in collaboration with faculty members in those programs. The task force will conclude its work by communicating its findings to the Executive Council and recommending a course of action.

The task force is to have a term of approximately two years. It will hold meetings in 2012 and 2013; it is expected
to submit a progress report to the council in February 2013 and its final report no later than February 2014. The council appointed the members of the task force: Carlos J. Alonso, Columbia Univ.; Russell A. Berman, Stanford Univ. (chair); Sylvie Debevec Henning, East Carolina Univ.; Lanisa Kitchiner, Howard Univ.; Bethany Nowviskie, Univ. of Virginia; Elizabeth Schwartz, San Joaquin Delta Coll., CA; Sidonie Ann Smith, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor; and Kathleen Woodward, Univ. of Washington, Seattle.

4. Establishment of Steering Committee on New Structures for Languages in Higher Education. Pursuant to the recommendation of the council’s planning group on the association’s language agenda (see May 2012 PMLA 690–92), the council established a joint MLA-ADF committee to oversee the development of an outreach program that will include as one of its components the language consultancy project that the council initiated in 2010. The council gave the new committee the following charge:

The Steering Committee on New Structures for Languages in Higher Education (SCNSL) is charged with establishing the joint MLA-ADF outreach program that aims to serve departments and faculty members in languages other than English. The outreach program will include the following features:

- a consultancy service, available on request to departments that are members of the ADFL
- a network of field representatives who can undertake campus visits locally and participate in workshops, seminars, and conferences either locally or nationally
- special workshops, seminars, or conference presentations on relevant topics (e.g., curricular redesign, assessment)
- mechanisms for disseminating MLA and ADFL findings, policies, and guidelines (e.g., regular convention sessions, an online forum, Webinars)

The SCNSL will be responsible for recruiting the field representatives who will provide most of the outreach services described above. Field representatives will normally be past members of the ADFL Executive Committee or the MLA Executive Council and will serve for a term that the SCNSL will specify.

The SCNSL will report annually to both the MLA Executive Council and the ADFL Executive Committee.

The steering committee’s initial term is two years, from 1 July 2012 through 30 June 2014. The council authorized funding for one in-person meeting a year at the MLA office and for the field representatives’ outreach activities. The steering committee is to have six members, drawn from both the MLA membership and the ADFL membership; two of the members, one from the MLA and one from the ADFL, will be co-chairs. In addition, the members of the working group that oversaw the council’s consultancy project are to be invited to serve as consultants to the new committee. The council made the following appointments to the steering committee: Dawn E. Bratsch-Prince, Iowa State Univ.; Patrick M. Bray, Ohio State Univ., Columbus; Debra Ann Castillo, Cornell Univ.; Jane Hacking, Univ. of Utah (cochair); Catherine Porter, State Univ. of New York, Coll. at Cortland (cochair); and Timothy Jon Scheie, Eastman School of Music, Univ. of Rochester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dues Class</th>
<th>Current Dues Schedule</th>
<th>Proposed Dues Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Under $15,000</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 $15,000–$20,000</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 $20,000–$30,000</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 $30,000–$40,000</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 $40,000–$50,000</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 $50,000–$60,000</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 $60,000–$70,000</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 $70,000–$80,000</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 $80,000–$100,000</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>$151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R $100,000–$120,000</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T $120,000–$140,000</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>$193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V $140,000–$160,000</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W $160,000–$180,000</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X $180,000–$200,000</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Over $200,000</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Student</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Joint Secondary</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Foreign Language Requirement for Doctoral Students in English. The council reviewed a draft of the statement it had discussed preliminarily at the October 2011 council meeting (see May 2012 PMLA 690–92). The council approved a revised version of the statement, the text of which reads as follows:

The MLA urges that doctoral programs in English require advanced competence in at least one language other than English of all PhD candidates, at either the admission or the exit point. We also urge that doctoral programs offer funding and support to students who study additional languages beyond this requirement.

Those who pursue a PhD in English are engaged in deep study of a language and its literary and cultural expressions. Most likely they will teach works in translation during their career. Knowledge of several languages and the process of language learning offer more than research tools enabling students to read primary and secondary materials in their original form. They promote conscious- ness of and sensitivity to the multilingual contexts in which Anglophone literatures are written and to the work of translation in which writers and readers engage in the contemporary world on a daily basis. Multiple language proficiency promotes the cultural literacy essential to a teaching career in the global university of the future.

6. Enhancement of the Job Information List (JIL) through an Agreement with Interfolio. At the previous council meeting, the staff received the council’s authorization to pursue an agreement with Interfolio (see May 2012 PMLA 694) to develop the JIL into a fully integrated job search announcement and application management service for departments and a job application, dossier, and document delivery service for candidates. At the present meeting, the staff reported to the council on the main features of the proposed agreement.

Job seekers applying for positions advertised in the JIL will be able to establish and maintain Interfolio accounts free of charge (avoiding the normal nineteen-dollar-a-year account fee). Job seekers will also be able to send requests for letters of recommendation directly from their Interfolio accounts, and recommendation writers will be able to upload their letters once, directly to job seekers’ Interfolio dossiers. Writing samples, teaching portfolios, letters of recommendation, and other application materials will reside in applicants’ Interfolio dossiers as electronic files, and applicants will be able to respond to search committees’ requests by making available as part of their job application any selection of materials they choose. When an Interfolio account holder establishes a candidacy for a position in a department that uses the Interfolio software, Interfolio will charge the applicant six dollars for delivery of the initial letter of application and other materials the department requires. All subsequent deliveries of materials to that department—of a dossier, writing sample, or other documents—will be free of charge. When applying to departments that do not use Interfolio’s software, account holders will send initial letters of application outside the Interfolio system. Subsequently, for each electronic delivery of a dossier, writing sample, or other materials to such departments, Interfolio will charge the standard six dollar fee. (A higher rate applies for the mailing of paper copies.)

Departments that place ads in the JIL and elect to receive applications through Interfolio will be able to manage, from a single secure interface, all applications received as well as search committee memberships for multiple searches and positions. The interface allows departments to grant varying levels of permission for access to dossiers and evaluations connected with candidates’ applications. Department and search committee chairs will be able to manage customized electronic communications with candidates individually and in selected groups. The fee for placement of an ad in the JIL and rights to use Interfolio’s search management software is five hundred dollars per search; ADE- and ADFL-member departments will receive a twenty-five percent discount (a per-search rate of $375). These fees represent significant savings to departments, which paid over a thousand dollars in 2011–12 to place a JIL ad and use Interfolio’s software. All advertisers will have access to the full suite of tools, although no department will be required to use the JIL–Interfolio service. The aim of this simple pricing structure is to enhance the JIL’s functions and services at the lowest possible price and signal the association’s commitment to the new services as a profession-wide standard.

The agreement with Interfolio covers three years, beginning in 2012–13. Interfolio’s licensing fee, which covers departments’ access from the JIL system to Interfolio’s software and job seekers’ access to Interfolio’s dossier services, will be offset by the fees charged to departments for placing ads. That is, the establishment of the JIL–Interfolio service is designed to be revenue-neutral for the association.

Council members saw many advantages to an integrated JIL–Interfolio service, especially when compared with individual institutions’ proprietary systems. They asked the staff to explore with Interfolio how its system might interface with proprietary systems. They expressed concern about the possibility of increased costs to job applicants, especially those who submit applications to departments that do not use Interfolio’s software. The staff will also try to negotiate a reduction in the fee that job applicants will pay to initiate an application. In response to a question about the availability of other service providers, the staff noted that Interfolio is the leading provider of dossier services to job seekers in higher education and that many students in our fields are already using Interfolio’s dossier services. In response to another question, the staff said that department administrators would be able to familiarize themselves with the new system through demonstrations at the ADE and ADFL summer seminars and an online tutorial. At the end of the
of the association’s investment portfolio and to reaffirm to the trustees to thank them for their stewardship. The council decided to write a letter to postdocs who are interested in retooling. (2) The council made one correction to the draft of the minutes taken by Arizona officials raised broader issues that the council wished to address. Several council members drafted an open letter to these officials, post it at the MLA Web site, and send it to other organizations (including the NCTE) and to the media. [Note: When the open letter was copyedited, it was reformatted as a statement. The statement, which appears below, was disseminated as the council directed.]

Recent legislative and policy initiatives in the Tucson Unified School District concern us deeply as teachers and scholars of language and literature. In 2010, the Arizona state legislature passed HB 2281, which was signed by Governor Jan Brewer. The bill forbade any school district to include in “its program of instruction any courses or classes . . . that promote resentment toward a race or class of people[,] . . . are designed primarily for pupils of a particular ethnic group[,] . . . [or] advocate ethnic solidarity instead of the treatment of pupils as individuals.” State Superintendent of Public Instruction John Huppenthal declared in January 2011 that Tucson’s widely admired Mexican American studies program was in violation of HB 2281. The board of the Tucson Unified School District appealed that ruling in June 2011. In December 2011, Judge Lewis Kowal of the Tucson Unified School District millions of dollars in state aid.

As a result, the district’s school board voted 4-1 to shut down the Mexican American studies program. The school board president, Mark Stegeman, took several
measures to bring that termination about, the most publicized of which involved the removal of several books from ethnic studies classrooms in Tucson and their sequester in a storage facility.

That removal, in addition to being objectionable, followed from a series of discriminatory acts by Arizona officials, all of which run against principles that the MLA considers vital. Although Arizona HB 2281 was ostensibly passed to ensure that students would be taught as individuals, we see the law as part of an attack on Mexican American citizens and cultures—including, but not limited to, undocumented immigrants. We are unaware of any similar argument or policy initiative aimed at, for instance, Americans of Irish or Polish descent; no one argues that Irish American or Polish American children who learn about their ethnic heritages in school are promoting racial resentment or ethnic solidarity, even though the history of Irish and Polish immigration in the United States is not free of instances of ethnic discrimination. Furthermore, we contend that the law has been discriminatory in effect, insofar as the superintendent’s ruling, the judge’s decision, and the school board president’s order applied it to target and shut down only Mexican American studies programs. We note that programs in Native American and African American studies seem not to have triggered fears and anxieties among the supporters and enforcers of HB 2281.

We believe that teaching Mexican American children about Mexican American history and heritage is teaching them as individuals—indeed, precisely as the individuals they are. But more important, we believe in teaching all American children about Mexican American history and heritage. We therefore reject the reasoning behind HB 2281 and behind the decisions made by Superintendent Huppenthal, Judge Kowal, and President Stegeman, on two counts. First, we reject the idea that Mexican American studies is a subject “designed primarily for pupils of a particular ethnic group.” Throughout the United States, and especially in the Southwest, Mexican American studies is an integral part of the study of American identity and history; ideally, every schoolchild should be acquainted with that fact. Second, we reject the idea that Mexican American studies promotes “resentment toward a race or class of people” or advocates “ethnic solidarity.” Mexican American studies is a field of inquiry, not a form of propaganda. It is designed to lead to a greater understanding of the histories and cultures of the peoples of the United States, not to any partisan political outcome.

Our beliefs about ethnic studies and about curricular reform generally have been formed by forty years of scholarly research, informed debate, and open-ended discussion. As an organization devoted to the study of language and literature, the MLA is allied with primary and secondary school educators who teach in this field and who participate in the long project of questioning and undoing the biases of the traditional curriculum, which for many years ignored or demeaned the histories and cultures of people deemed “ethnic.” We see that project as central to the mission of American education at all levels. As former MLA President Sidonie Smith wrote in her 2010 letter to Governor Brewer, “ethnic studies curricula have provided important gateways for students to learn about the diversity of heritages in the United States, a key educational goal of the liberal arts education that is the bedrock of American higher education. . . . Policies that curtail this vision will weaken the quality of education.”

Finally, we see in these actions a threat to academic freedom and intellectual inquiry. To pursue scholarly inquiries into the histories and cultures of the United States, teachers must be free from legislative and judicial interference. Allowing state officials to declare legitimate branches of history and culture out of bounds—to the point of seizing and sequestering books—is inimical to the principles on which the United States was founded. And to students in the Tucson Unified School District, such actions send a far more chilling message than anything they might find in the books that have been removed from their classrooms.

We urge all relevant Arizona officials—Governor Brewer, Superintendent Huppenthal, Judge Kowal, and President Stegeman—to reconsider these rulings, reverse these decisions, and reaffirm the freedom of inquiry on which an open society must depend.

12. Lobbying Language. While discussing the letters that the Coalition for International Education (CIE) sent to members of Congress and to the Department of Education urging that federal support for foreign language programs be maintained or expanded (see May 2012 PMLA 688), council members had expressed dissatisfaction with the arguments that the CIE used to justify its lobbying stance. A council member therefore drafted alternative language for such lobbying letters, using arguments more in keeping with the MLM’s mission to justify federal support for language programs. Council members accepted the draft language but thought that it needed to be recontextualized as a statement that MLA members could use in any lobbying efforts they might undertake. The council asked several of its members to reread the draft and present a fuller statement to the council for consideration at its next meeting.

13. Departmental Reports. The chairs of the three council subcommittees that had reviewed the annual reports from the MLA department heads summarized subcommittee members’ comments and questions. After this general review, the council accepted the reports with thanks.

14. Guidelines on Reading Convention Papers. Pursuant to a request from the staff, the council approved the following guidelines on the delivery of papers at the convention:

Because we want convention sessions to generate discussion and dialogue among panelists and attendees, reading in absentia (whether by Skype, video conferencing, audio delivery, or presentation by surrogates) is not normally
permitted. Presenters who are unable to attend the convention due to unforeseen emergencies are reminded that they may post their papers on the Program Web site.

15. **New Data-Collection Project.** The council received a report on a new MLA project to crowd-source data on the employment conditions of faculty members employed off the tenure track in contingent positions. The project has two components: a Web interface that will provide access to Department of Education data that visitors to the site can use to judge whether an institution follows MLA recommendations and an online survey designed to collect data from individual part-time faculty members about their salaries, benefits, and other conditions of employment. Rosemary Feal said the staff hoped to roll out the project Web site in May. She added that the staff would consult the council about whether and how to make public the nonpersonal, nonidentifying data collected from individuals.

16. **Request from the Committee on Information Technology (CIT).** The CIT asked the council to approve the revised version of a committee document that the council had originally approved in May 2000. The council approved the revised document, *Guidelines for Evaluating Work in Digital Humanities and Digital Media.* [Note: The revised document has been posted on the committee’s page at the MLA Web site.]

17. **Review of Resolutions Approved by the 2012 Delegate Assembly.** In accordance with article 7.B.3 of the MLA constitution, the council reviewed the two resolutions that the 2012 Delegate Assembly had approved (see May 2012 *PMLA* 676–82) to determine whether to forward the resolutions to the membership for a ratification vote. Resolutions that (1) do not impede the council’s ability to carry out its fiduciary responsibilities, (2) do not contain erroneous, tortious, or possibly libelous statements, (3) do not pose a threat to the association’s continuing operation as a tax-exempt organization, and (4) are consistent with the provisions of articles 2 and 9.C.10 of the MLA constitution may be forwarded to the membership.

One resolution affirms the right of members of the academic community to challenge decisions curtailing educational access, to oppose political interference in academic programs, to teach and promote the work of controversial writers, and to address social-justice issues relevant to their communities without fear of reprisal. The other resolution is a statement of support for peaceful protests that bring student debt to the forefront of national debate. The council determined that the resolutions posed no constitutional, legal, or fiduciary problems. The council therefore authorized nonsubstantive copyediting changes to the wording of the resolutions and forwarded them to the membership for the required ratification vote. In addition, the council established the schedule for the resolution comment process and the date for determining members’ eligibility to participate in the ratification vote.


19. **Appointments to MLA Committees.** The council made sixty-one appointments to the standing committees of the association and appointed eleven committee chairs or cochairs. The names of all new and continuing committee members will appear at the MLA Web site.

20. **Banned Books Week.** A council member requested that the MLA become a sponsor of Banned Books Week, which is held during the last week of September each year and aims to draw attention to the problem of censorship and celebrate the freedom to read. The first Banned Books Week was held in 1982; the original sponsors were the American Booksellers Association, the American Library Association, and the National Association of College Stores. The council approved the request.